



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,770	11/14/2003	Manabu Kusano	9333/363	8765
74980	7590	05/12/2009	EXAMINER	
ALPINE/BHGL P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610			BARQADEL, YASIN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/713,770

**Applicant(s)**

KUSANO ET AL.

**Examiner**

YASIN M. BARQADLE

**Art Unit**

2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 20, 2009 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's arguments filed on January 20, 2009 have been considered but are not deemed persuasive.

- Claims 1-24 are presented for examination

**Response to Amendment**

In essence the Applicant argues Examiner's proposed combining of Rosenberg and Samaria is improper. "Rosenberg specifically states that a user has no directed control over which songs get played on an audio channel. (See Col. 8, lines 5-23). Accordingly, altering Rosenberg to transmit music data in response

to selection of music data by a user rather than broadcasting music based on music preferences submitted by users alters a principle operation of Rosenberg." (Pages 9 first paragraph of the Remarks).

Examiner notes that Rosenberg discloses that "User 110, however, has indirect control over which songs get played because user 110 has direct control over a channel's profile and a channel's profile specifies, among other things, the types of sound recordings that the channel play at least a majority of the time."(col. 8, lines 7-11). Rosenberg continues to say "User 110 may specify that a particular set of sound recordings is played in a particular order at a particular time if, and only if, user 110 owns a copy of each sound recording in the set."(col. 8, lines 20-23).

Additionally, Rosenberg teaches a list presenting unit operable to present a list of contents available to be transmitted to a second client apparatus based on data registered by the data registering unit (a playlist (fig.4).

In section VI of 2141.02 [R-5], the MPEP clearly states "A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). However, "the prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives

because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed....” In *re* Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). See also MPEP §2123.

Because of reason stated above the Examiner maintains the combination of Rosenberg with Yamarua is proper and does not alter the principle operation of Rosenberg.

Applicant also argues that “Rosenberg teaches away from the combination of Rosenberg and Yamaura as contemplated by the Examiner.” Pages 9 last paragraph.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case both Rosenberg and Yamaura are directed to the same endeavor of invention. Rosenberg is concerned “Personalized audio system and method”, (Title) while Yamaura is about “Portal server and information supply method for supplying music content of multiple versions” (Title). Furthermore, Rosenberg teaches a list presenting unit operable to present a list of contents available to **be transmitted** to a second client apparatus based on data

registered by the data registering unit (a playlist (fig.4) according to profile of user 110 at device 202 or 299 that is presented to the user; col. 8, lines 49-53). Therefore, there is no reason why one ordinary skill in the art would not be able to combine the music or audio list presenting system of Rosenberg to content supplying servers and transmitting desired music data of a list of music data in response to selection of the music data by a user (see Yamaura abstract) of Yamaura.

Regarding Applicant's argument that "Rosenberg fails to make any mention of selecting a decoder, or selecting based on a desired medium as recited in claim 22." (Page 12).

The Examiner notes in paragraph [0043] of the Applicants published specification states "Multiple types of the decoders 25 are prepared corresponding to multiple types of media such as a CD, an SACD, a DVD, an MD, the radio, and the television. Any one of these multiple decoders 25 selectively comes into operation according to the medium of the data received from the server 104, and outputs the data after decoding. When the decoded data is audio data, the amplifier 26 converts the audio data into an analog audio signal, then, amplifies the data by a predetermined amount, and outputs from the speaker 29."

The Examiner also notes claim 22 requires "selecting a decoder used to reproduce the content on the client apparatus based on the desired medium". Particularly, the portion cited above in the specification explains how the

decoder selection works by saying "When the decoded data is audio data, the amplifier 26 converts the audio data into an analog audio signal, then, amplifies the data by a predetermined amount, and outputs from the speaker 29." Rosenberg Fig. 2 shows DECODER 222 receiving audio data via 210 amplifying the data and outputting on speaker 108 (see (decoder 222, fig. 2 and col. 10, lines 1-18 and fig. 26). Hence Rosenberg clearly shows decoder 222 coming into operation when the decoded data is an audio data, amplifying it and outputting to the speaker.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §§ 102-103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102-103 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22-24 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rosenberg et al US Patent Number 7028082, hereinafter "Rosenberg"

As per claim 22, Rosenberg teaches a multimedia reproducing method (fig. 2), comprising the acts of:

- providing a server (server 280);
- providing a user record area on the server (col. 14, lines 19-31);
- providing a client apparatus operable to connect with the server apparatus through a network (202); selecting content through the second client apparatus (col. 9, lines 42-56 and col.12, lines 15-43); registering data from a desired medium to the user record area on the server apparatus (col. 4, lines 49-67 and col. 42-56); selecting a decoder used to reproduce the content on the client apparatus based on the desired medium (decoder 222; fig. 22 and 23 and col. 5, lines 9-41. see col. 25, lines 50-67 and col. 26, lines 23-43 outputting audio data via decoder 222 based on speaker 108, fig. 2); and

- decoding data transmitted from the server to the second client apparatus (decoder 222, fig. 2 and col. 10, lines 1-18 and fig. 26).

Even if Rosenberg is not seen as teaching selecting a decoder used to reproduce content on a client apparatus on a desired medium, this feature would clearly have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It is uncontestable that selecting a decoder to reproduce a content based on desired medium is the most widely used way multimedia



reproduction systems. It would have been obvious to do so in order to enable Rosenberg's system to select a suitable decoder for reproducing a multimedia content based on a particular media type.

As per claim 23, Rosenberg teaches the multimedia reproducing method of claim 22 further comprising the act of selecting an operating mode relating to reproduction quality or equalization (see fig. 16 and 17).

As per claim 24, Rosenberg teaches the multimedia reproducing method of claim 22 wherein the server apparatus generates an operation screen presented on said second client apparatus based on the content of the selected function and transmits the screen to said second client apparatus (col. 9, lines 42-56 and col.12, lines 15-43).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-13, 16-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Rosenberg et al US Patent Number 7028082, hereinafter "Rosenberg" in view of Yamaura et al USPN. 7272629, (hereinafter "Yamaura").

As per claims 1,13 and 17, Rosenberg teaches a multimedia reproducing system (Fig. 2) comprising:

- a first client apparatus (202, fig. 2) including an uploading unit operable to transmit data from a desired medium to a server apparatus (218, fig. 2), the server apparatus including a data registering unit operable to register data transmitted from said first client apparatus by said uploading unit to a user record area prepared in advance for individual users (user profile 219 are stored in server 218);

- a list presenting unit operable to present a list of contents available be transmitted to a second client apparatus based on data registered by the data registering unit (a playlist (fig.4) according to profile of user 110 at device 202 or 299 is presented); and

- a server data transmitting/receiving unit operable to transmit data to said second client apparatus (col. 8, lines 49-53), in response to a selection of desired contents of the list of contents available to be transmitted to the second client apparatus (col. 20, lines 16-42; fig. 15 and Col. 21, lines 17-48);

- wherein the second client apparatus comprises a selecting unit operable

to select the desired content from the list presented by the list presenting unit (user 110 selects desired content col. 2, lines 53-65) and a reproducing unit (processing unit 212) operable to receive the data transmitted from the server data transmitting/receiving unit and reproduce the data through decoding (decoder 222, fig. 2) that corresponds to a media type (col. 10, lines 1-18 and fig. 26).

Although Rosenberg shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he does not explicitly show transmitting desired music data of a list of music data in response to selection of the music data by a user.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rosenberg, as evidenced by Yamaura USPN. (7272629).

In analogous art, whose invention is about a portal server and information supply method for supplying music content of multiple versions, discloses transmitting desired music data of a list of music data in response to selection of the music data by a user (abstract). Giving the teaching of Yamaura, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Rosenberg by employing the system of Yamaura in order to advantageously allow a user of any one of client terminal apparatus to acquire any one of music piece data sets possessed or suppliable

by a plurality of music information servers, so that the user can minimize wasteful expense (col. 19, lines 20-29).

As per claim 3, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 1, wherein the reproducing unit includes a decoder and memory operable to store a plurality of decoding programs that correspond to a media type and is operable to select a decoding program that corresponds to the desired medium (col. 5, lines 9-41).

As per claim 5, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 1, wherein the first client apparatus includes a function selecting unit operable to select an operation mode relating to a reproduction quality, equalization, or notifying the server apparatus of selection content (see fig. 16 and 17); and the server apparatus includes an operation screen generating unit operable to generate an operation screen presented on said second client apparatus based on the content of the function selected by said function selecting unit, and transmit the screen to the second client apparatus (col.12, lines 15-43).

As per claims 6,16,19 and 23, Rosenberg teaches the multimedia reproducing system, wherein the second client apparatus includes a function selecting unit operable to select an operation mode relating to a reproduction quality, equalization, or notifying the server apparatus of selection content (see fig. 16

and 17); and the server apparatus includes an operation screen generating unit operable to generate an operation screen presented on said second client apparatus based on the content of the function selected by said function selecting unit, and transmit the screen to the second client apparatus (col.12, lines 15-43).

As per claim 7, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 1, wherein the list presenting unit provides the second client apparatus with a list of contents prepared by the server apparatus (col.12, lines 15-43); and the server apparatus includes a charging unit operable to conduct purchase processing of selected content (see fig. 8, purchase button).

As per claim 8, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 7, wherein the data registering unit registers data relates to selected content in the user record area (In one embodiment, after user 110 selects purchase-button 804, device 202 communicates with a remote server to verify that the user is qualified to make the purchase (e.g., does the user have enough money is his or her account) (step 914). This implies user is registered with the system.

As per claim 9, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 1, further comprising: a last position storing unit operable to store last position

information indicating the last reproduction position by said reproducing unit; and a last position managing unit operable to manage reading and writing of the last position information to and from the last position storing unit; wherein the data relates to content selected by said second client apparatus is reproduced from a position corresponding to the last position information stored in the last position storing unit (col. 19, lines 1-21 and col. 17, lines 22-49).

As per claim 10, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 9, wherein the server data transmitting/receiving unit obtains data corresponding to content selected on the second client apparatus starting from the position corresponding to the last position information stored in the last position storing unit, and transmits the data to the second client apparatus (col. 19, lines 1-21 and col. 17, lines 22-49).

As per claim 11, Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 10, further comprising a last position managing unit in said second client apparatus, and is operable to transmit the last position information to the server apparatus (col. 19, lines 1-21 and col. 17, lines 22-49).

As per claim 12 Rosenberg teaches multimedia reproducing system of claim 10, wherein the last position managing unit and the last position storing unit are

provided in the server apparatus, and the last position information is stored in the server apparatus (col. 17, lines 22-49).

As per claim 20, Rosenberg teaches the server apparatus of claim 17, wherein the list presenting unit provides a list of contents prepared by the server apparatus, and the server apparatus further comprises a charging unit operable to conduct purchase processing of a selected content when said client apparatus selects the content prepared by said server apparatus (col. 9, lines 42-56 and col.12, lines 15-43).

As per claim 21, Rosenberg teaches the server apparatus of claim 20, wherein data corresponding to selected content is registered to said user record area when the content is selected on the client apparatus “In one embodiment, after user 110 selects purchase-button 804, device 202 communicates with a remote server to verify that the user is qualified to make the purchase (e.g., does the user have enough money in his or her account) (step 914)” (col. 42-56). This implies user is registered with the system.

Claim 2,4,14-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Rosenberg et al US Patent Number 7028082, hereinafter

“Rosenberg” and Yamaura in view of Dodrill et al USPN. 6643621, (hereinafter “Dodrill”).

As per claims 4 and 18, although Rosenberg and Yamaura shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Rosenberg and Yamaura do not explicitly show converting data content into a predetermined format. Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rosenberg and Yamaura, as evidenced by Dodrill USPN. (6643621).

In analogous art, whose invention is a method for referencing and producing audio information, discloses conversion operation specifies an audio output format that is compatible with the type of audio data that is compatible with the originator of the request for information [Col. 7, lines 32-35 and col. 15, lines 28-38]. Giving the teaching of Dodrill, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Rosenberg and Yamaura by employing the system of Dodrill so that the appropriate format that is compatible to each is user’s multimedia output system.

Dodrill further teaches wherein the server data transmitting/receiving unit transmits the data corresponding to content in the predetermined format to the client apparatus [abstract, Col. 7, lines 32-35 and col. 15, lines 28-38].



As per claims 2 and 14, Dodrill teaches a multimedia reproducing system wherein the reproducing unit includes a plurality of decoders corresponding to a media type and is operable to select a decoder that corresponds to the desired medium (col. 4, lines 52-59 and Col. 6, lines 53-55 and col. 15, lines 28-38).

As per claim 15, Dodrill as modified teaches wherein the reproducing unit is provided with a decoder that corresponds to a predetermined format and decodes data converted into the predetermined format [Col. 7, lines 32-35 and col. 15, lines 28-38].

Claims 1, 13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue US Patent Number (6,567,847).

As per claims 1,13 and 17, Inoue teaches a multimedia reproducing system (Fig. 2) comprising:

a first client apparatus (200, fig. 1) including an uploading unit operable to transmit data from a desired medium to a server apparatus (201, fig. 1), the server apparatus including a data registering unit operable to register data transmitted from said first client apparatus by said uploading unit to a user record area prepared in advance for individual users (col. 7, lines 59- to col. 8, lines 6);

a list presenting unit operable to present a list of contents available be transmitted to a second client (203, fig. 1) apparatus based on data registered by the data registering unit (fig. 21-22B and col. 9, 40-47); and

a server data transmitting/receiving unit operable to transmit data to said second client apparatus (See fig. 1 and 3, col. 9, lines 25-58), in response to a selection of desired contents of the list of contents available to be transmitted to the second client apparatus (col. 25, lines 25-27; fig. 21);

wherein the second client apparatus comprises a selecting unit operable to select the desired content from the list presented by the list presenting unit (col. 25, lines 25-27; fig. 21 and fig. 3) and a reproducing unit operable to receive the data transmitted from the server data transmitting/receiving unit and reproduce the data through decoding that corresponds to a media type (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 18, lines 43-67).

Claims depending to claims 1, 13 and 17 are rejected as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Inoue US Patent Number (6,567,847).

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Inoue US Patent Number (6,567,847).

As per claim 22, Inoue teaches a multimedia reproducing method (fig. 2), comprising the acts of:

providing a server (server 201, fig. 1);

providing a user record area on the server (col. 7, lines 59- to col. 8, lines 6); providing a client apparatus operable to connect with the server apparatus through a network (203, fig. 1); selecting content through the second client apparatus (fig. 21-22B and col. 9, 40-47); registering data from a desired medium to the user record area on the server apparatus (col. 7, lines 59- to col. 8, lines 6); and

decoding data transmitted from the server to the second client apparatus (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 18, lines 43-67).

Inoue shows substantial features of the claimed invention including decoding process of downloaded content to be recorded on a disc (media) (col. 10, lines 50-61 and col. 18, lines 43-67). However, even if Inoue is not seen as teaching selecting a decoder used to reproduce content on a client apparatus on a desired medium, this feature would clearly have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It is uncontestable that selecting a decoder to reproduce a content based on desired medium is the most widely used way multimedia reproduction systems. It would have been obvious to do so in order to enable Inoue's system to select a suitable decoder for reproducing a multimedia content based on a particular media type.

As per claim 23, Inoue teaches the multimedia reproducing method of claim 22 further comprising the act of selecting an operating mode relating to reproduction quality or equalization (col. 27, lines 53 to col. 28 line 16).

As per claim 24, Inoue teaches the multimedia reproducing method of claim 22 wherein the server apparatus generates an operation screen presented on said second client apparatus based on the content of the selected function and transmits the screen to said second client apparatus (See fig. 1 and 3, col. 9, lines 25-58).

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yasin M Barqadle/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456